

THIS IS THE WOMAN'S EDITION

It contains matter of special interest to women who are Americans in spirit and interested in the welfare of their homes and country.

When you have read it, pass it along to some woman who may thereby become interested in its message and purpose.

Extra copies of this number will be mailed from this office to addresses supplied by you at the rate of one cent a copy. Bundles sent postpaid to one address at the rate of 75 cents a hundred.

Women and Democracy

THERE ARE AMERICANS who are women; and there are Americans who are men; but the pope's Knights of Columbus are all masculine. Which perhaps accounts for their password—The Pope is King. What if the pope were queen? What if the cardinals were ladies? What if the bishops and archbishops of Rome were feminine in fact as well as in dress?

Some women say that this is a man's world—that women have been deprived of their proper share in human affairs, while men have made and remade this old world at their own will with slight consideration of woman's just rights.

Without discussing that issue, and without taking sides with men or women as to the relative rights of each, we should like to ask what women could expect if the world were ruled by a bachelor pope, and its affairs administered by bachelor cardinals with the connivance of bachelor bishops and bachelor priests?

The fact is that this old world has been so ruled through many centuries, and the effect of such domination still lingers. Modern civilization, and its growing consideration for women and their reasonable rights, has come up through conflict with those ecclesiastical bachelors mentioned.

Women who have read history can recall queens as well as kings among secular rulers; but there was but one popess whom Rome now denies and indignantly repudiates as though such an infringement on masculine monopoly would be horrible.

If there has been discrimination against women; if they have been denied a proper part in the constructive work of civilization; what influence is so much to blame for it as the Jesuit anti-feminist philosophy which the papal system has substituted for Christian religion in the so-called Roman Catholic church?

Women are indeed welcome in that alleged church—for certain servile purposes. They may be nuns and "sisters" to beg and scrub and toil for the greater glory of the "fathers." They may even teach children what they are told, but there is no place for them in the hierarchy or ruling class of the cult.

And there is no hope of their ever attaining to such a dignity. A woman may sit in the American congress with the same rights and privileges as her brother members; but her election to that body, and woman's suffrage as a political principle, is opposed by Cardinal Gibbons, all the pope's cardinals, and all his clergy.

Can't American women take the hint, when it is so broadly given, that Rome has no use for them but as drudges and servants?

And now Rome, by means of its local agents and its tractable subjects of the pope, enters American politics to reshape American civilization. Rome is ruled by a papal monarch, and is therefore dissatisfied with democracy.

There is the democratic public school, and its teaching of that American document, the Declaration of Independence, which says that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Such teaching is heretical, for a faith in the American people as the source of political power is in plain conflict with Pope Leo's assertion that popes stand in the place of God Almighty on this earth, to rule the world without responsibility to man—or woman.

Democracy also tolerates the Protestant denominations, or "sects" as the popes call them. Such toleration is intolerable to the triple-crowned occupants of the throne which they claim as a heritage from Saint Peter.

Democracy also tolerates and regulates civil marriage, another affront to popery which declares marriage a sacrament and asserts its own monopoly of the sacraments.

And now democracy is crowning its evil work with equal suffrage—with a welcome to women as voters and public officials. It is hard to tell whether that, or prohibition of the liquor traffic, is most grievous to the bachelor conspirators against American civilization.

Papal politics is being urged upon the American people in the guise of a religion. If accepted, its worst effects would fall upon American women just as it has upon the women of other countries.

If American women are yet the victims of discrimination; how about the women of Mexico, Spain, and Austria, where popery has been the dominating power and influence for so long up until very recent times?

American women are coming to their own; slowly perhaps, but with a steady certainty that is threatened by nothing so much as papal propaganda. If democracy survives the attack of Jesuitism, its progress will move forward with women and men sharing equally in the labor and in the triumph.

More than two dozen states have already granted women the right to vote for presidential electors. This concession of a just right also imposes a grave responsibility. By that act women become the guardians of their own liberties, for they are given the power to exercise a choice concerning the laws under which they live.

They now stand side by side with their brothers at the polls to approve measures for the common welfare and defeat such schemes as popery and its political program in this country. It is to be hoped that they will make good use of the opportunity to defend the public school and other conservators of the nation's welfare.

THE MENACE

The Canon Law on Marriage

By GILBERT O. NATIONS, President of the Free Press Defense League.
52 Bliss Building, Washington, D. C.

THE NEW CODEX JURIS CANONICI, or Code of Canon Law, promulgated by the pope now reigning, contains 132 canons devoted to the subject of marriage. Some of these canons embrace numerous sections and paragraphs. They treat far less of moral and spiritual than of purely formal and legal aspects of the subject. Without the slightest hesitation they overrule virtually every important law enacted by congress and the state legislatures in this country touching the requisites, validity and effects of marriage.

Do these papal statutes purport to bind the clergy and members of the Church of Rome in this and other countries? Hear Canon 1073, which, when translated into English, reads thus:

The general laws of the Church bind all persons for whom they are issued everywhere in the world. Laws issued for a particular territory bind those persons who have a domicile or quasi-domicile in that territory and actually live there.

The necessary limits of this discussion preclude the possibility of reviewing the vast number and variety of provisions in the marriage laws of Rome. Only one or two of those provisions can be presented and must serve to illustrate the spirit and trend of them all. The first section of Canon 1070, translated into English, reads as follows:

Marriage of an unbaptized person with a person baptized in the Catholic church or converted to the Church from heresy or schism is null and void.

Millions of husbands and wives living in domestic virtue and happiness and rearing children to become the voters and statesmen and jurists of our great republic are branded with lawless concubinage and their children with illegitimacy by that brutal section, which declares that marriages between Roman Catholics and other persons are no marriages at all.

Regarding the form of a valid marriage ceremony, the canon law overrules legal provisions that are universal in this country. Throughout the United States, marriage can be legally solemnized by judge or justice of certain courts or by any ordained minister who is an American citizen. But this law is repealed by Canon 1094 of the law of Rome, which makes the following provision:

Those marriages only are valid which are contracted before either the pastor or the ordinary of the place or a priest delegated by either and at least two witnesses, in conformity, however, with the rules laid down in the following canons, and save for the exceptions mentioned below in Canons 1098 and 1099.

The exceptions noted in Canons 1098 and 1099 provide that in case of impending death or when the priest or ordinary cannot be had, a common-law marriage in presence of two witnesses will suffice; and the canon law declines to interfere in marriages between persons both of whom are without the Roman church. The former of these exceptions show clearly the papal hatred and contempt of our law by preferring a marriage without any legal ceremony to one solemnized by a judge or minister as our laws provide.

If any reader doubts whether the papal hierarchy and clergy in this country bow to the foregoing canon law and enforce it upon Roman Catholics, that doubt will be removed by reading two

questions and answers published in the Question Box columns on the editorial page of *The Tablet*, diocesan organ of New York City, April 12. They read as follows:

Q. A Catholic woman and a non-Catholic man were married at Borough Hall. Is it necessary for them to be married again in the Catholic church before the woman is allowed to receive the sacrament?

A. Yes. The marriage so contracted is not recognized by the Church. It is invalid. Many times in this paper it has been stated that a marriage between two Catholics or between a Catholic and non-Catholic must be contracted in the presence of one's pastor, or one delegated by him, and two witnesses.

Q. A non-Catholic girl married a Catholic man. They were married by an Episcopalian minister and later divorced. Does the Catholic church recognize such a marriage? The ex-husband enlisted and is killed. This same girl wishes to marry another Catholic man and wants to adopt his faith and be married in a Catholic church. Can this be done?

A. The marriage in question was not valid. Apparently there will be no obstacle placed in the way of the young lady if she wishes to pursue the proposed plan.

Intrusion of the canon law as here set forth within the territorial limits of this country strikes at the very essence of our national sovereignty. It is elementary in the law of nations that the jurisdiction of every sovereign power is exclusive within its own territory. The only exceptions to this universal rule exist, not as a matter of legal right, but through comity and friendship between the respective nations.

But the autocrat of the vatican demands of his millions of subjects, dispersed in every land and under every flag, instant and unquestioning submission to his law in matters of education, marriage and divorce, legitimacy of children, validity of certain contracts, style of dress, title to real and personal property, taxes to his government and various other matters of vital importance which are fully and righteously regulated by the law of the land.

Such intrusion by any other reigning prince or potentate is universally treated as cause of war. But the hundred enthroned princes located in our cities to reign over the local provinces of the papal empire as procurators and the millions of their subjects participate actively in our elections and many of them enjoy the same political rights as loyal citizens who are bound by no foreign allegiance.

Is it bigotry to state these elementary principles of law? Do the American people fully understand and appreciate this monstrous international paradox that has no counterpart in all the records and institutions of the world? Who ought to enact the laws that regulate the education, domestic and property rights of our citizens?

Is the papal autocrat a safer and wiser fountain of legislative, executive and judicial procedure for this country than legislatures, executives and courts that exist by the voice of the people under our constitutional law? Shall we continue to permit the papal empire to lay upon our schools and homes the guilty hands that have shed more innocent blood, enslaved more virtuous women and helpless children and held more peoples in degradation and ignorance than all other despoticisms that have plundered and oppressed the world?

remain—under the power of love and affection, but always under his power.

If there were any "good Catholic" women on that delegation, as there presumably were, there was nothing left for them but to go home and meditate on their social status as companion animals to their masculine lords.

Popery decrees that woman must

be satisfied with a master's affection which is sufficient in quantity to be shared alike with her and his other animate property—horses, dogs and cattle.

Papal morality enjoins men to be kind and affectionate to domestic animals, and to their domesticated wives—to hold and rule both under the power of love and affection, but always under power. The status of woman under popery is made sufficiently clear by Pope Pius's pious reply to the Italian women.

The contrast of that attitude with the treatment accorded women by the great international commission in session at Paris is eloquently expressive of the hopes held out to womankind by reactionary Rome through its papal monarch, and by progressive civilization through its liberal delegates to the international conferences at Versailles.

Reasonable Restitution

From *The Masonic Observer*. Millions of dollars of public funds have been illegally paid to parochial schools and sectarian colleges all over the United States, in many instances far more than enough to pay for the educational institutions that have received these lawless payments.

A careful checking up of funds diverted in this way contrary to law should be made, and steps taken in every possible instance to secure restitution. Where return of the cash itself cannot be secured, legal action against the school properties should be commenced and they should be bid in by the states for these obligations.

According to available statistics, there are nearly 60,000 American women locked up in the "religious" penitentiaries maintained by an Italian pope on American soil.

Popery and Woman's Rights

LESS THAN THREE YEARS AGO, on Dec. 7, 1916 to be exact, the National Association Opposed to Woman's Suffrage held one of its conventions at Washington, D. C.

Though that convention, or the issue which brought it into existence, was wholly of political nature, we find a papal dignitary, Monsignor Russell, participating by reading a letter condemnatory of woman's suffrage by Archbishop Gibbons who was and is the chief administrator of popery in the United States.

It is evident that the pope's chief agent in America embraced the opportunity to register his master's pontifical disapproval in the most public and authoritative manner possible. We quote the following from Gibbons' tirade against feminine progress and equal suffrage from *Church Progress*, a Roman Catholic publication of St. Louis dated Dec. 14, 1916:

I regard woman's rights, women and the new school of female progress, as the worst enemies of the female sex. . . . If woman desires the dual empire of public and private life, then, like the fabled dog beholding his image in the water, she will lose both. She will fall from the lofty pedestal where nature and Christianity have placed her, and will fail to grasp the political scepter from the strong hand of her male competitor.

And so progressive women are declared by official popery to be the worst enemies of their sex. Women who are so imbued with the ideals of democracy as to desire participation in government, and a voice in making the laws under which they live, are contemptuously compared to a greedy dog grasping for everything in sight.

Ecclesiastical eloquence goes the limit of language to express its denunciation of practical democracy. Women are scornfully exposed to the reproach of desiring a "dual empire" because they seek the full rights of American citizenship.

But women shouldn't worry. It is not so long ago that just such nabobs as Gibbons were offering substantially the same argument against manhood suffrage. Whenever an autocrat has desired to separate humanity from its just rights and voice in public affairs, his first stunt was to set mankind on a pedestal of some kind and start some sort of scare about a possible fall therefrom.

That "lofty pedestal" prepared for women by popery, is exceedingly poetic when used for rhetorical purposes. They used to set her male companion on the same pedestal to keep him out of politics. Men, as well as women, were advised by ecclesiastical authority to leave political matters and public affairs to those whom God in His infinite wisdom had placed over them with a divine right to dictate.

They used to preach the divine right of kings. They are now clinging to the divine right of popes; and, lest woman suffrage may upset the latter, women should climb up on their imaginary pedestals, hold on desperately, and not reach out for what is due them, lest perchance they slip and lose something.

Behold woman on the lofty pedestal prepared for her by popery—a drudge in some H. O. G. S. laundry; a slave for life in some nunnery; begging in pairs to further enrich the papal system so priests can live like lords from the proceeds of their unpaid labor.

Thousands of women could fall off that pedestal without the least injury to person or prospects.

Woman must not put forth her hand to grasp the political scepter lest she drop the scepter already in her hands. Behold that scepter which popery has given her—a mop, a "charity box," a begging basket. If she were to drop those magic wands and scepters, the priests might go hungry—or thirsty, which is worse.

The Pope Dressing American Prelates

THE EBONY DARKNESS of Roman Catholic ignorance and superstition and the readiness with which the pope and hierarchy take advantage of those traits to beguile and stultify the masses are manifest on every hand. *The New York Herald* of April 14 gave the following account of the forthcoming bestowal of the pallium upon two Irish prelates who have recently been enthroned in this country:

Thursday, May 8, has been set for the conferring of the pallium upon the Most Rev. Patrick J. Hayes, archbishop of New York. This is the neckpiece of wool from lambs that graze in the vatican gardens. The ceremony will take place in St. Patrick's cathedral.

Mgr. Charles A. O'Hern, the official bearer of the pallium and the papal bulls from Pope Benedict XV, is expected to arrive soon. It is believed he started from Rome a week ago last Saturday.

Mgr. O'Hern is bearing the pallium for the Most Rev. Dennis J. Dougherty, archbishop of Philadelphia. This will be conferred on him in the Philadelphia Cathedral Tuesday, May 6.

The three North American cardinals and the archbishops and most of the bishops of the country are expected to attend the ceremony for Archbishop Hayes. The investiture of the pallium will be made by Archbishop Giovanni Bonzano of Washington, D. C., the Apostolic delegate, who will act for the pontiff.

An archbishop cannot convoke a council, or consecrate bishops, or ordain priests, or consecrate churches until he has received the pallium. It is a band of white wool worn on the shoulders, having two strings of the same material and four purple crosses worked upon it. It is worn by the pope and sent by him to patriarchs, primates, archbishops and sometimes to bishops as a token that they possess "the fullness of the episcopal office."

Dennis J. Dougherty was enthroned, or "enthronized," in Philadelphia early last year. But it now appears that, though reigning about a year on his throne as a full-fledged prince and procurator of the papal empire, he is episcopally impotent till this alien and hideous garment woven from wool grown in Italy is placed upon his shoulders by the Irish priest that acted as interpreter at the visit of President Wilson to the reigning sovereign pontiff or by the Italian papal delegate residing at our national capital.

Patrick J. Hayes was assigned to the great papal province of New York long after the "enthronization" of his Irish fellow in the Quaker city, but the papal autocrat has purposed to leave him episcopally naked and impotent till after he first places his magic woolen pallium on his New York favorite who was assigned to the duty of bossing our papal chaplains during the war.



NO BETTER investment can be offered to the public, considering the rate of interest, short term to run, and the security of the United States Government behind them, than the Victory Loan Notes issued by Uncle Sam to finance peace.

The patriotism of the American people is a sufficient inducement to buy these notes; but any person of knowledge will advise their purchase as the best investment or profitable means of saving that can be found on the market.

The Difference

Paris April 14.—One of the greatest compliments ever paid to women was given Thursday evening, when the full Commission of the League of Nations received a delegation of seven women, representing the International Council of Women and the Conference of Women Suffragists of allied countries.

President Wilson, as president of the commission, presided, though it was the first time he had been able to attend a meeting outside of his home since his illness. After general introductions the Marchioness of Aberdeen and Temair spoke a few words. Then resolutions were presented by the delegates.

About six years ago a similar delegation of progressive Italian women applied to Pope Pius X for recognition of their equal rights as human beings. Instead of receiving the recognition desired, they got a lecture, the gist of which is contained in the following paragraph thereof:

After creating man, God created woman and determined her mission: namely, that of being man's companion, helpmate, and consolation. It is a mistake, therefore, to maintain that woman's rights are the same as man's. Woman, created as man's companion, must so

Patriotic Women Organize

Many patriotic women participated in the convention at Chicago, on April 13, which considered and adopted plans for organizing American women in connection with the rapidly growing I. O. B.

The convention and its work were the result of many letters received at this office from women who requested that a call be made and publicity given thereto in the columns of *THE MENACE*.

It was the unanimous opinion of those in attendance that an organization should be perfected to unite patriotic women in an association of their own for the work needed, and which they are especially qualified to do.

General discussion was productive of many good ideas which were incorporated in the fundamental plans, and details are to be worked out in printed form to facilitate further procedure.

These plans will be ready for distribution in about one week from the date of this paper; and women who are interested are urgently requested to send for information and suggestions for local organization and work.

Inquiries concerning the women's organization should be addressed to Fanny Lee Reynolds, National Secretary, care *THE MENACE*, AURORA, MO.